

Monday, 21 October 1974

1400 hours

DDI Conference Room

Meeting to Discuss Project SAFE

FBIS Contributing material--but used only in propaganda analysis.

OCI Mostly enthusiastic--OCI views on paper less positive than reality.
:go ahead--no need for delay. New collection systems will
require it--OCI needs more speed and 24-hour operation.
:reservation--CRS "paperless environment" overly emphasized.
::Crisis management but needs to be quick.
Good for basic documents and previous reports on crisis.
::Branches will have more need for clericals to put things
into computer.
:recommends steering group on implementing arrangements.

OPR Reservation about miracle working--but OPR for it.

OER For it--pilot branch unique in need for data and its handling.

IAS Not familiar with it--plea for support for non-production
offices. Real-time capability needed.

OSR Clear need--experiment demonstrated this BUT potential
areas of disconnect--SAFE, OJCS, Delta data, COINS,
PI files for -going to take a lot of space. Text
versus data--WORK SPACE

OER What are modular options? in case of budget squeeze.

OBGI Not involved in experiment--but need is greater for ready
reference in detail--worried about down time.

STAT

22 October 1974

MEMORANDUM FOR: Associate Deputy Director for Intelligence
SUBJECT : SAFE Briefing for DCI on 23 October

1. This memorandum responds to your request for a short statement on what you or the DDI should say at the 23 October briefing for the DCI on SAFE.

2. Final arguments for or against SAFE should rest with neither CRS nor OJCS but rather with the production offices. The principal need at this briefing, consequently, is for the DDI or ADDI to state his feelings on the utility of a SAFE-like system to DDI production.

3. CRS, OJCS, the Comptroller, the DDA, and Logistics all need some fairly explicit guidance for SAFE to be implemented. Answers are not expected to be forthcoming from the DCI on Wednesday, but not much can happen until the answers are provided.


a. Given the magnitude and time requirements of SAFE, does the DCI want to keep going?

The immediate impact is about \$300,000 to be spent in support of the systems design by CRS in late FY 1975. But, because of the long lead times, planning must start now on the later, more expensive phases. CRS can provide the \$300,000 but only if there are no cuts in the present budget level, e.g., for pay raise absorption.

b. How fast and with what priority does the DCI wish to proceed?

The production offices cannot expect SAFE to be generally available to them until FY 1976 is well along. To achieve this date, it will require an extraordinary effort by Logistics, Communications, OJCS, and CRS and about \$6.3 million of FY 1974 dollars--not presently available in the DDI. This FY 1976 figure does not cover Logistics costs. SAFE will require nearly \$20 million in FY 1977. If SAFE is to be a reality in 1980, the project will need major funding in FY 1976 and FY 1977. The DCI, consequently, must decide quickly what sorts of priorities should be assigned to SAFE.

STAT


H. C. EISENBEISS

Director, Central Reference Service

cc: C/DDI MS

Koontz paper for
SAFE

22 October 1974

SAFE Briefing for DCI

1. Colby needs to understand that:

--The dollar cost of building the SAFE system will not exceed

--There are additional costs for communications, logistics, space renovation which are harder to estimate at this time, but a conservative estimate might be \$3-4M (or whatever figure John McMahon comes up with).

--There are unbudgeted costs in FY 1976 of about \$7M for which we must: (a) submit an amendment to our budget now before OMB; (b) go for a reserve release in FY 1976; or (c) absorb.

--There is a possibility that a new building may have to be constructed to house computer and related ADP equipment which would add millions to the cost. (Two further points on this: (a) the Agency might have to go this route whether there is a SAFE or not; and (b) even if Colby were to approve in principle a new building now, it would not be available in time for the implementation of SAFE. It would provide long term relief, but it is unlikely that the necessary approvals could be obtained, funds budgeted, plans drawn and approved, and construction completed in less than five years.

--SAFE probably will not fit into this building without moving someone else out of the building--even if the main computer processors are put in a separate building.

--Colby's unwavering support will be required to bring this thing off. He must so instruct the Comptroller (to provide resources) and the DDA (for ADP, Commo, and logistics support).

2. If Colby can be made to hoist aboard the above, then you should try to obtain the following immediate decisions from him:

--Agreement in principle that the goal of SAFE is something we should push ahead to achieve with the understanding that there are specific milestones at which we (or he) may decide to cut our losses if experience tells us that it won't work. I think we should offer that the first such milestone will be

STAT

at the end of the system design phase (spring/summer 1975).

--Agreement that he is prepared to try to obtain an additional \$7M in FY 1976 for SAFE. His options appear to be: (a) to absorb it somehow; (b) to submit an immediate \$7M supplement to our FY 1976 budget request that OMB now has under consideration; or (c) seek a reserve release for \$7M in early FY 1976. (I recommend the reserve release because we will know more precisely what the early-on costs will be.)

--Agreement that the Office of Logistics should be instructed to begin immediately to develop space options for accommodating SAFE.

--Agreement that responsibility for overall direction of the project will remain with the D/CRS but that OJCS will have technical responsibility and direction over the development and acquisition of hardware and software. (At some point, you should stress that a users steering panel will be established, as well as a technical steering panel (to include CRS, OJCS, Logistics, Commo, et al?).

RECAP - Project SAFE

I would like to conclude by recapping the decisions we are seeking and to put them into some perspective.

First, I want to state my own position. I have followed the development of Project SAFE very closely and have tried to keep in touch with its developments as well as I can. I come out unequivocally enthusiastic in my endorsement of the project. This is not to say that I am not aware that it is a very ambitious program which will be a real test to the people in CRS, to OJCS, and to a number of the support elements in the Agency. Needless to say, it will also be a challenge to the analysts because it in fact means a radical change in the lifestyle of a good number of our people.

But even though it is a challenging and demanding program, I feel we have no choice but to go with it. I know of no other alternative that looks as promising. Finally, I would say that I would rather go into the Twentieth Century with the program of our design meeting our needs than to be dragged into it by having similar programs thrust upon us.

We have tried in this briefing to give you as good dollar estimates as we can at this time for the SAFE system and the attendant communications, logistics, and space costs and problems.

We are essentially asking for six decisions:

a. A decision to proceed with building the SAFE system over the next five years with an estimated cost and \$3.5 to \$4 million for associated logistics and support costs.

STAT

b. To authorize CRS to proceed immediately with the systems design study. This will cost on the order of \$300,000.

c. To approve some \$7 million in FY 1976 costs which are now unbudgeted. Your approval of this decision also involves a decision on going for a reserve release or submitting an amendment to our budget which is now before OMB. A third alternative would be to direct the Comptroller to find other in-house ways of absorbing the \$7 million.

d. To direct the Office of Logistics and OJCS to begin immediately, in cooperation with CRS, to develop the programs necessary to support Project SAFE.

e. To decide the overall execution of the project. I would suggest that it be a joint CRS/OJCS effort under the direction of the Director/CRS.

f. To direct the establishment of a technical panel composed of both in-house and outside experts to advise on and to monitor the development of the project.

If you decide to approve Project SAFE, you are running headlong into another decision which can no longer be postponed. This decision is on the general question of space in the Headquarters Building. I would suggest for your consideration both a short-term and a long-term resolution to this decision:

a. The short-term resolution is to direct the DDA to identify and relocate those Agency components which can function without being physically located in Headquarters. I would use the circumstance of this activity to also relocate to the Headquarters Building those elements which have a clear need to be here but which have been prevented from doing so because of space limitations.

b. The long-term resolution is to give a direction to proceed with the construction of a new building at the Headquarters site to accommodate the growing complex of computer and related ADP equipment.

STAT

Approved For Release 2006/02/01 : CIA-RDP80B01495R001200140022-3

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2006/02/01 : CIA-RDP80B01495R001200140022-3